

Appl. No. : 09/675,095
Filed : September 28, 2000

REMARKS

By this paper, Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17 have been amended. Claims 14 and 16 have been cancelled, without prejudice. The amendments have been to clarify the claims, correct typographical errors or change dependencies. Claims 19 – 23 have been added. Therefore, upon entry, Claims 1-23 will be pending. Reconsideration of the claims for patentability is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Objections

Claims 1 was objected to for having a typographically error, and this error has been corrected. Claims 6-10 were objected to for being in improper multiple dependent form. The dependencies have been corrected such that no multiple dependent claim depends from another.

Discussion of Claims Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected the claims by combining the teachings of Kreider, et al. (USPN 5,166,511) and Pardo (IEEE journal article).

Claim 1 recites that the sensor array elements are configured such that: “the spatially variant portion surrounding the substantially constant resolution portion, and the density of sensor element location sites continuously increasing or decreasing between the substantially constant resolution portion and the spatially variant portion.” One embodiment of this pattern, for example, is shown in Figure 11C, in which the sensor spacing merges gradually from the substantially constant resolution portion into the space variant portion. In such configurations, the inner portion is substantially constant resolution and the outer portion is a spatially variant portion.

Kreider teaches a discontinuous combination of a fovea and a retina. Pardo teaches a spatially variant array of sensors, and no constant resolution portion. Therefore, even if there was a suggestion to do so, which there clearly is not, plugging the Pardo array into the fovea of Kreider would result in an entirely spatially variant array. Thus, combining Kreider with Pardo would reduce back to the Pardo array, i.e., a fully spatially variant array. Applicant’s claims are directed to a continuous change in density between two different special sensor array configurations, namely, substantially constant resolution and spatially variant. This feature is neither shown nor suggested by the references, either individually or in combination.

Appl. No. : 09/675,095
Filed : September 28, 2000

Similar arguments can be made for Claim 11. The remaining claims depend from either Claim 1 or 11 and necessarily incorporate their respective subject matter pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim rejections have been overcome and that the claims should be allowed.

New Claim

Applicant has written in new Claims 19 – 23 to further obtain the legal protection to which he is entitled. Claims 19 – 23 are also neither taught nor suggested by the prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner sees any impediment to allowance that may be resolved with a telephone conference, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP



Dated: 10/22/04

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550